



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/226,939	01/08/1999	JOHN K. VINCENT	063170.6289	8916
5073	7590	08/24/2007	EXAMINER	
BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.			LY, ANH	
2001 ROSS AVENUE			ART UNIT	
SUITE 600			PAPER NUMBER	
DALLAS, TX 75201-2980			2162	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/24/2007	ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mike.furr@bakerbotts.com  
ptomail1@bakerbotts.com

50

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/226,939	<b>Applicant(s)</b> VINCENT ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Anh Ly	<b>Art Unit</b> 2162	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 May 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-69 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-39 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 52-59, 64 and 69 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 40-51, 60-63 and 65-68 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 08 January 1999 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                       | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. This Office Action is response to Applicant's response filed on 05/29/2007.
2. Claims 1-39 were cancelled.
3. Claims 40-51, 60-63 and 65-68 are pending in this Application.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

4. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

5. Claims 40-42, 45, 52 and 60-69 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The "indication from the database" does not support clearly in the description of the application's specification. Applicant is advised to amend the claim to clarify it and for their intended use in order to one of ordinary skill in the art to make use the invention as claimed. Applicant is reminded that no new subject matter should be added.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

8. Claims 40-42, 46-51, 60-62 and 65-67 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No.: US 5,586,328 issued to Caron et al. (hereinafter Caron) in view of US Patent No.: US 6,199,063 B1 issued to Colby et al. (hereinafter Colby).

With respect to claim 40, Caron a method of generating dependency information for code objects stored in a database (figs. 4 and 8, col. 10, lines 25-32); comprising:

dependencies of procedural code objects stored in the database (the layout dependency code is stored on the storage device or in main memory item 38 in fig. 1: col. 6, lines 30-38 and col. 4, lines 48-50); and

generating a dependency information tracking array based on the indication of one or more dependencies of procedural code objects (figs. 4 and 8, creating a code dependency by a procedure call: col. 10, lines 25-32).

Caron teaches generating dependency code layout for the object code from a program storing on the main memory. Caron further teaches recursive method for generating dependency code (see fig. 12 and col. 15, lines 40-45). Caron does not clearly teach recursively querying a database and receiving an indication from the database as claimed.

However, Colby teaches recursively or rewriting the query by a recursive query rewrite call (fig. 8 and col. 12, lines 30-35) and using a flag for indicating a field residing in the database (fig. 19 and col. 21, lines 8-12).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Caron with the teachings of Colby to utilize the use of recursively query on the database and an indication from a database as disclosed (Colby's figs. 8 and 19), into the system of Caron for the purpose of implementing queuing and recursion the data stored in a database, thereby, enabling a user to have a quickly and efficiently deriving answer to a relational database query (Colby's col. 1, lines 20-22 and col. 3, lines 65-67).

Art Unit: 2162

With respect to claim 41-42, Caron a method of generating dependency information for code objects stored in a database (figs. 4 and 8, col. 10, lines 25-32); comprising:

dependencies of procedural code objects stored in the database (the layout dependency code is stored on the storage device or in main memory item 38 in fig. 1: col. 6, lines 30-38 and col. 4, lines 48-50); and

generating a dependency information tracking array based on the indication of one or more dependencies of procedural code objects and incorporating the one or more dependencies of specifications of object-oriented code objects into the dependency information tracking array (figs. 4 and 8, creating a code dependency by a procedure call: col. 10, lines 25-32).

Caron teaches generating dependency code layout for the object code from a program storing on the main memory. Caron further teaches recursive method for generating dependency code (see fig. 12 and col. 15, lines 40-45). Caron does not clearly teach recursively querying a database and receiving an indication from the database as claimed:

However, Colby teaches recursively or rewriting the query by a recursive query rewrite call (fig. 8 and col. 12, lines 30-35) and using a flag for indicating a field residing in the database (fig. 19 and col. 21, lines 8-12).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Caron with the teachings of Colby to utilize the use of recursively query on the database and an indication from a

Art Unit: 2162

database as disclosed (Colby's figs. 8 and 19), into the system of Caron for the purpose of implementing queuing and recursion the data stored in a database, thereby, enabling a user to have a quickly and efficiently deriving answer to a relational database query (Colby's col. 1, lines 20-22 and col. 3, lines 65-67).

With respect to claim 46, Caron teaches further comprising compiling one or more code objects stored in the database in debug mode using a database code object debugging tool (processing of debugging source code to a compiled program: col. 1, lines 55-60).

With respect to claim 47, Caron in view of Colby teaches further comprising identifying one or more dependent objects stored in the database that are INVALID (Colby's fig. 19, col. 21, lines 1-18).

With respect to claim 48, Colby teaches further comprising identifying one or more cyclic dependencies among code objects stored in the database (col. 7, lines 4-15 and col. 10, lines 18-32).

With respect to claim 49, Colby teaches wherein identifying one or more cyclic dependencies comprises utilizing a graph traversal algorithm to identify one or more cyclic dependencies (col. 7, lines 4-15 and col. 10, lines 18-32).

With respect to claim 50, Colby teaches further comprising generating a dependency graph for code objects stored in the database based at least in part on the dependency information tracking array (col. 7, lines 4-15 and col. 10, lines 18-32).

Claim 60 is essentially the same as claim 40 except that it is directed to a system rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 40 hereinabove.

Claim 61 is essentially the same as claim 41 except that it is directed to a system rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 41 hereinabove.

Claim 62 is essentially the same as claim 42 except that it is directed to a system rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 42 hereinabove.

Claim 65 is essentially the same as claim 40 except that it is directed to a computer readable medium rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 40 hereinabove.

Claim 66 is essentially the same as claim 41 except that it is directed to a computer readable medium rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 41 hereinabove.

Claim 67 is essentially the same as claim 42 except that it is directed to a computer readable medium rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 42 hereinabove.



Art Unit: 2162

9. Claims 43-45, 51, 63 and 68 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No.: US 5,586,328 issued to Caron et al. (hereinafter Caron) in view of US Patent No.: US 6,199,063 B1 issued to Colby et al. (hereinafter Colby) and further in view of US Patent No. 5,926,819 issued to Doo et al. (hereinafter Doo).

With respect to claim 43, Caron in view of Colby discloses a method of generating dependency information as discussed in claim 40.

Caron and Colby disclose substantially the invention as claimed.

Caron and Colby do not teach parsing the source code of the database for data manipulation statements that fire triggers; and identifying one or more data manipulation statements that fire triggers.

However, Doo teaches DML statement being applied to fire the triggers (col. 5, lines 22-42, also see figs. 2-4) and parsing the tree of DML statement (col. 5, lines 38-42 and col. 6, lines 50-58).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for modifying the teachings of Caron and Colby with the teachings of Doo by incorporating the use of data manipulation statements such as DML to fire the triggers. The motivation being for having secure triggers in order to prevent the replication or even corrupt other data in the database (Doo's col. 2, lines 58-62).

With respect to claim 44, Caron in view of Colby discloses a method of generating dependency information as discussed in claim 40.

Caron and Colby disclose substantially the invention as claimed.

Caron and Colby do not teach parsing the source code for UPDATE, DELETE or INSERT statements.

However, Doo teaches DML statements being applied to INSERT, DELETE and UPDATE operations (col. 5, lines 5-12).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for modifying the teachings of Caron and Colby with the teachings of Doo by incorporating the use of data manipulation statements such as DML to fire the triggers. The motivation being for having secure triggers in order to prevent the replication or even corrupt other data in the database (Doo's col. 2, lines 58-62).

With respect to claim 45, Caron in view of Colby teaches a method of generating dependency information as discussed in claim 40.

Caron teaches generating dependency code layout for the object code from a program storing on the main memory. Also, Caron teaches recursive method for generating dependency code (see fig. 12 and col. 15, lines 40-45). Caron does not clearly teach recursively querying a database and receiving an indication from the database of one or more dependencies of procedural code objects stored in the database.

However, Colby teaches recursively or rewriting the query by a recursive query rewrite call (fig. 8 and col. 12, lines 30-35) and using a flag for indicating a field residing in the database (fig. 19 and col. 21, lines 8-12).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Caron with the teachings of Colby. One having ordinary skill in the art would have found it motivated to utilize the use of recursively query on the database and an indication from a database as disclosed (Colby's figs. 8 and 19), into the system of Caron for the purpose of implementing queuing and recursion the data stored in a database, thereby, enabling a user to have a quickly and efficiently deriving answer to a relational database query (Colby's col. 1, lines 20-22 and col. 3, lines 65-67).

With respect to claim 51, Caron in view of Colby discloses a method of generating dependency information as discussed in claim 40.

Caron and Colby disclose substantially the invention as claimed.

Caron and Colby do not teach database catalog.

However, Doo teaches the database system stores information as metadata in a data dictionary within the database (col. 6, lines 27-32).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for modifying the teachings of Caron and Colby with the teachings of Doo by incorporating the use of data manipulation statements such as DML to fire the triggers. The motivation being for having secure triggers in order to prevent the replication or even corrupt other data in the database (Doo's col. 2, lines 58-62).

Art Unit: 2162

Claim 63 is essentially the same as claim 43 except that it is directed to a system rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 43 hereinabove.

Claim 68 is essentially the same as claim 43 except that it is directed to a computer-readable medium rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 43 hereinabove.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

10. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: Claims 52-59, 64 and 69 are allowed because these claims have some distinct features: "parsing the source code of the database for data manipulation statements that fire triggers and generate a dependency information tracking array based on the indications of one or more dependencies of procedural code objects stored in the database, one or more dependencies of specifications of object-oriented code objects stored in the database, one or more dependencies of implementations of object-oriented code objects stored in the database and one or more dependencies on triggers of code objects stored in the database." These distinct features, in conjunction with all other limitations of the dependents and independent claims render claims 52-59, 64 and 69 them allowable.

11. Claims 52-59, 64 and 69 are allowed.

***Conclusion***

12. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2162

### Contact Information

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ANH LY, whose telephone number is (571) 272-4039 or via e-mail: ANH.LY@USPTO.GOV (written authorization being given by Applicant(s) - MPEP 502.03 [R-2]) or fax to (571) 273-4039 (examiner's personal fax number). The examiner can normally be reached on TUESDAY – THURSDAY from 8:30 AM – 3:30 PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **John Breene**, can be reached on **(571) 272-4107**.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). Any response to this action should be mailed to: Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, Washington, D.C. 20231, or faxed to: Central Fax Center **(571) 273-8300**

  
SHAHID ALAM  
PRIMARY EXAMINER

ANH LY   
JUL. 27<sup>th</sup>, 2007